Theory of the Lamb shift and Fine Structure in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$

Marc Diepold,[1,*] Julian J. Krauth,[1] Beatrice Franke,[1] Aldo Antognini,[2,3] Franz Kottmann,[2,3] and Randolf Pohl[4,1]

[1] *Max Planck Institute of Quantum Optics, 85748 Garching, Germany.*
[2] *Institute for Particle Physics, ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland.*
[3] *Paul Scherrer Institute, 5232 Villigen-PSI, Switzerland.*
[4] *Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Institut für Physik, QUANTUM, and PRISMA Cluster of Excellence, Mainz, Germany.*

(Dated: June 17, 2016)

An up to date review of the theoretical contributions to the 2S → 2P Lamb shift and the fine structure of the 2P-state in the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ ion is given. This summary will serve as the basis for the extraction of the alpha particle charge radius from the muonic helium Lamb shift measurements at the Paul Scherrer Institute Switzerland. Individual theoretical contributions needed for a charge radius extraction were compared and compiled into a consistent summary using the already established framework we used for muonic hydrogen and deuterium. The influence of the alpha particle charge distribution on the elastic two-photon exchange is studied to rule out possible model dependencies of the energy levels on the electric form factor of the nucleus.

arXiv:1606.05231v1 [physics.atom-ph] 16 Jun 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The CREMA Collaboration has recently performed Lamb shift measurements in the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ ion [1, 2]. Here we survey the current knowledge of the theory in muonic helium ions which is needed for the extraction of a reliable charge radius of alpha particle (^{4}He nucleus). This includes the evaluation of the Lamb shift with respect to the alpha particle root-mean-square (rms) charge radius (r_α), as well as the study of the fine structure of the 2P-state. Both problems have been analyzed recently [3–6] but significant differences between the authors made it necessary to review the individual theory contributions. The same was previously done for muonic hydrogen [7] and deuterium [8].

Recent measurements of the 2S → 2P Lamb shift (LS) in other muonic atoms have already provided the rms charge radii of the proton and the deuteron with unprecedented precision. Results from muonic hydrogen measurements provided a proton charge radius of $r_p^\mu = 0.84087(26)^{\mathrm{exp}}(29)^{\mathrm{theo}}$ fm. [9, 10]. This value is ten times more precise than the CODATA value of 0.8775(51) fm [11], however also 4 %, or 7 σ, smaller. This discrepancy created the so-called "Proton-Radius-Puzzle" (PRP) [12–14] that is currently one of the largest experimental deviations in the standard model of particle physics.

Certain solutions of the PRP suggest that there might be a fundamental difference between muonic and electronic bound systems [15–18]. Some of these ideas beyond the standard model of particle physics (BSM) also made predictions for the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ LS [17, 18]. When compared to the alpha particle charge radius from electron scattering experiments ($r_\alpha = 1.681$ fm [19]), the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ measurement will provide new input on the PRP.

Ultimately the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ measurement will be able to provide an improved value of the alpha particle charge radius. This charge radius will also be used for tests of fundamental bound state QED by planned measurements of the 1S → 2S transition in the electronic $^4\mathrm{He}^+$ ion [20–22].

The goal of this report is to provide a complete overview on the current state of knowledge concerning $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ theory, and to identify the limiting factors in the accuracy of the extracted charge radii from the LS measurements. The finite size effect that is sensitive to the charge radius of the alpha particle amounts to ≈300 meV or 20% of the LS in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$. The frequency uncertainty of the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ LS measurements is on the order of 15 GHz, which corresponds to 0.06 meV[a]. This value serves as accuracy goal for the theory. If the currently accepted charge radius of $r_\alpha = 1.681(4)$ fm [19] is used to extract the LS energy, the uncertainty provided by the charge radius results in ≈1.4 meV.

The paper is structured as follows: Sec. II summarizes the pure Quantum-Electro-Dynamics (QED) contributions to the Lamb shift (independent of the charge radius and nuclear structure effects). We use the theory calculations of Borie [3] (the most recent version v7 on the arXiv) and the theory group around Martynenko, Faustov, Krutov et al. [4] (referred to as Martynenko for brevity) that provide a summary of terms contributing to the LS energy. Various partial results of QED terms provided by Karshenboim and colleagues [5, 23] (referred to as Karshenboim further on) and Jentschura [6] are compared.

Sec. III summarizes the individual parts contributing to the finite size effect, i.e., terms that are affected by the muon wavefunction overlap with the nucleus, together with higher order corrections scaling with different powers of $\langle r_\alpha^2 \rangle$, the second moment of nucleus' charge distribution. We use the works of Borie [3], Martynenko [4],

* Corresponding author: marc.diepold@mpq.mpg.de

[a] 1 meV ≙ 241.799 GHz

and Karshenboim [5]. Our summary provides the charge radius coefficient of the LS parameterization needed to extract the charge radius from the experimentally measured transitions.

In Sec. IV we discuss the two-photon exchange (TPE) in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$. Its first part is the so-called "Friar-moment", also known as the third Zemach moment of the nucleus (Sec. IV A). This term could dominate the uncertainty of the charge radius extraction in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ due to a possible model dependence on the shape of the nuclear charge distribution and the corresponding electric form factor (FF). In an effort to reduce this uncertainty, we studied different charge distributions and FF parameterizations in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ to calculate the corresponding energy shifts. We used the same calculation method as [4].

In Sec. IV B, the so-called nuclear and nucleon polarizability contributions to the LS are discussed. The nuclear polarizability, i.e., the inelastic part of the TPE stems from the virtual excitation of the nucleus and is related to its excitation spectrum [24]. It is the least accurately known part of the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ LS and was recently investigated in the TRIUMF/Hebrew group by Ji et al. [25]. They managed to reduce the uncertainty of the term by a factor of four compared to previous calculations by Friar [26]. We discuss cancellations with the elastic part of the TPE that were already present in muonic deuterium [8, 27].

The fine structure (FS) of the 2P-state in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ is studied in Sec. V. Our evaluation is based on the works of Borie [3], Martynenko [28] and Kashenboim [5, 23].

Throughout the paper the used convention is the following: The LS transitions energies and the FS splitting are given with respect to the upper level, i.e. the total energy differences are positive.

Labeling of individual terms in LS and FS follows the convention of our previous works [7, 8] in order to maintain comparability. Our summary is given in Tabs. I, II and III. Terms that were found not to agree were averaged for our determination and the resulting value is found in the "Our Choice" column. These averaged values are given by the center of the covering band of all values under consideration ν_i with the uncertainty of their half spread, i.e.:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{AVG} \quad = \quad & \frac{1}{2}[\mathrm{MAX}(\nu_i) + \mathrm{MIN}(\nu_i)] \\ & \pm \frac{1}{2}[\mathrm{MAX}(\nu_i) - \mathrm{MIN}(\nu_i)] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The values in the "Our Choice" column are followed by the initials of the authors that were used to obtain this value (B = Borie, M = Martynenko, K = Karshenboim, J = Jentschura, T = TRIUMF/Hebrew group: Ji et al.). Important abbreviations: Z is the nuclear charge, α is the fine structure constant, "eVP" is electron vacuum polarization, "μVP" stands for muon vacuum polarization, "hVP" stands for hadronic vacuum polarization, "SE" is self energy, "RC" are recoil corrections.

II. QED LAMB SHIFT IN $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$

First we consider pure QED terms that do not depend on nuclear properties. All terms listed in this section are given in Tab. I. As in other muonic atoms, the one-loop electron vacuum polarization (eVP; *#1*; see Fig. 1) is the largest term contributing to the Lamb shift. Martynenko provides a non-relativistic calculation for this Uehling-term (*#1*) together with a separate term for its relativistic corrections (Breit-Pauli correction, *#2*) [4]. The values of the main term plus its correction (*#1+#2*) agree exactly with the independent calculations of Karshenboim [5] and Jentschura [6, 29] who follow the same procedure. Borie's value (*#3*) already includes relativistic corrections of the order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^2$ due to the use of relativistic Dirac wave functions [3]. The additional $\alpha(Z\alpha)^4$ relativistic recoil correction to eVP (*#19*) already included by the other authors is treated separately in her framework [3].

The sum of all eVP contributions (*#1+#2 or #3+#19*) is in agreement between the calculations of all authors in the case of $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$. The average value of the Uehling contribution we use is:

$$\Delta E_{(1-\mathrm{loop\ eVP})} = 1666.2945 \pm 0.0015\,\mathrm{meV}. \tag{2}$$

The next largest term in the QED part of the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ Lamb shift is given by the two-loop electron vacuum polarization in the one-photon interaction order $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$ (*#4*). This so-called Källén-Sabry contribution is the sum of three Feynman diagrams as seen in Fig. 1 #4. It is calculated by Borie and Martynenko, and the agreement between both calculations is still satisfactory, although not as good as for the Uehling term.

The one-loop eVP contribution with two Coulomb lines (*#5*, see Fig. 1) is calculated by Martynenko [4] and Jentschura [6] and their results show satisfactory agreement. Borie cites a paper of Karshenboim [30], it is however unknown how she obtained the quoted value.

Karshenboim calculates the sum of both terms (*#4+#5*) [23]. The sum is in excellent agreement with the sum of Martynenko's values and also agrees with the calculation of Borie. The total contribution from two eVP loops in one and two Coulomb lines is given by:

$$\Delta E_{(2-\mathrm{loop\ eVP\ 1\&2\ C-lines})} = 13.2769 \pm 0.0026\,\mathrm{meV}. \tag{3}$$

Calculations of third order eVP contributions (3-loop eVP, *#6+#7* from Martynenko and Karshenboim agree for the required accuracy [3, 4, 23]. Karshenboim's value is chosen because he showed that the calculation method of Martynenko, first employed by Kinoshita and Nio [31], is not correct [23]. The value of the third order eVP is given by:

$$\Delta E_{(3-\mathrm{loop\ eVP})} = 0.0740 \pm 0.0030\,\mathrm{meV}. \tag{4}$$

We note the good convergence of the series expansion. The size of the third order contribution is comparable

in size to our accuracy goal while the uncertainty of the term is even smaller.

The contribution from two eVP loops in one and two Coulomb lines has additional RC of the order $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4 m$ (*#29*). This correction was calculated by Martynenko and Karshenboim, but the calculations differ by more than a factor of two [4, 23]. Since similar calculations for μD are in agreement in previous publications of both authors [23, 32] further investigation is needed. For our summary we choose the average value of 0.0039 ± 0.0018 meV due to the disagreement between Martynenko and Karshenboim. The small discrepancy is however not relevant.

The higher order "light-by-light" scattering contribution consists of three individual terms (*#9,#10,#9a*; see Fig 1). The first, so-called Wichmann-Kroll term, (*#9*) is in agreement between the works of Karshenboim and Martynenko [4, 33]. Borie also calculates the term independently and reports slightly smaller but still agreeing result. The remaining Virtual Delbrück (*#10*) and inverted Wichmann-Kroll (*#9a*) contributions have been calculated by Karshenboim [33]. The Virtual Delbrück contribution was calculated by Borie earlier [34] although with larger uncertainty. As can be seen from Tab. I, cancellations between the three terms occur. We therefore directly adopt Karshenboim's values to include all cancellations.

A term comparable in size to the Källén-Sabry contribution (but with opposite sign) is given by the effect of muon vacuum polarization (μVP) and muon self energy (μSE) (*#20*). The sum of both terms was calculated by Borie and Martynenko and they show satisfactory agreement [3, 4].

Muon self-energy (μSE) also contributes as correction to the one-loop eVP term (see Fig 1, *#11*). The results of Karshenboim and Jentschura agree very well [6, 33]. The calculation from Martynenko in Ref. [4] provides an incomplete value since he only calculates the second diagram seen in Fig. 1, *#11*. He adopts the complete value of Jenschura in his summary. Borie only partially calculates this term, as stated in appendix C of her summary [3]. Therefore our choice is compiled from Karshenboims's and Jenschura's value.

Insertion of an eVP or hVP loop in the μSE correction leads to corrections of higher order. The contribution of the additional eVP loop (*#12*) was calculated by Borie and Karshenboim and their values agree well. The hVP term (*#30*) was only calculated by Karshenboim and it is two orders of magnitude smaller than term *#12*. The μVP correction to the μSE contribution is not explicitly added to our summary. It is already included in our μSE value. The eVP and a μVP loop in the one photon interaction is given by the first digram of *#13* in Fig. 1. It was evaluated by Martynenko and Borie and their values agree. Karshenboim provides values of this contribution



FIG. 1. Important Feynman diagrams contributing to the QED part of the Lamb shift. #1 The Uehling Term; #4 The Källén-Sabry contribution; #5 One loop eVP in two Coulomb lines; #9/9a/10 Light-by-light scattering contributions; #13 Mixed eVP/μVP; #11 Self energy corr. to eVP; #31 Mixed eVP/hadronic VP; #12 eVP loop in SE contribution; #30 Hadr. loop in SE contribution; #32 μVP loop in SE contribution (included in #21). In our summary, terms #5, #9, #10, #9a, #13$^{(2)}$ and #31$^{(2)}$ also contain their respective cross diagrams.

summed with the respective term in the two Coulomb line diagram (second part of *#13*) [33].

Both terms are of similar size, therefore the values of Karshenboim and Borie/Martynenko differ by nearly a factor of two. Since the total term is small, this uncertainty is not important for the Lamb shift extraction. In addition, Karshenboim also calculated the influence of the mixed eVP-hVP diagram in one and two Coulomb lines (Fig.1, *#31*). Borie only gives a term labeled "higher order correction to μSE and μVP" (*#21*) that also includes the μVP loop in the SE contribution (previously *#32*).

The insertion of a hadronic vacuum polarization (hVP; *#14*) loop in the one Coulomb-photon interaction leads to another correction calculated by Borie and Martynenko. Both values agree within the uncertainty given in Bories's publication [3]. We use Bories result [3] as her uncertainty includes Martynenkos value [4].

Item *#17* is the main recoil correction in the Lamb shift, also called the Barker-Glover correction. The available calculations of the term by Borie, Martynenko and Karshenboim agree perfectly.

Further relativistic recoil corrections of the order $(Z\alpha)^5$ and $(Z\alpha)^6$ are also included in our summary (*#22, #23*). The $(Z\alpha)^5$ correction was calculated by Borie, Martynenko and Jentschura and their results agree. The $(Z\alpha)^6$ term was only determined by Martynenko, but is two orders of magnitude smaller than the term of the previous order, therefore we safely accept his value in our summary.

Martynenko provides a term called "radiative correction with recoil of the order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$ and $(Z^2\alpha)(Z\alpha)^4$". The respective terms are included in Borie's "higher order recoil" together with some additional terms not covered by Martynenko. We therefore adopt the more complete value of Borie (*#24*).

The total relativistic recoil in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ of the order $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$ (*#28*) was only calculated by Jentschura [6]. It includes the dominant seagull-term as well as two more Feynman-diagrams with smaller contributions. We directly adopt this result for our summary.

The "recoil finite size" contribution given by Borie [3] is not added to our list. We follow Pachucki's reasoning that this item should be discarded in the QED part, as it was calculated by Friar [35] and is already part of the inelastic nuclear structure dependent two-photon exchange term.

From the summary given in Tab. I we extract the total nuclear structure independent part of the Lamb shift:

$$\Delta E_{(LS,\,QED)} = 1668.4867 \pm 0.0134\,\mathrm{meV}. \qquad (5)$$

This value is in agreement with the sum given by Martynenko [4], and agrees also with Borie's value when discarding the recoil finite size term. In the case of $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ there is no Darwin-Foldy (DF) term as opposed to μD [8]. This term normally accounts for the Zitterbewegung of the nucleus but vanishes in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ due to its zero nuclear spin.

III. R^2 CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LAMB SHIFT

The 2S $\rightarrow$ 2P splitting is also directly affected by the ^{4}He rms charge radius. The largest contribution is given by the finite size effect that dominantly influences S-states due to their non-zero wave function ($\Psi(0)$) at the origin.

The leading order finite size contribution originates from the one-photon interaction between the muon and the helium nucleus, and is calculated by inserting the nucleon form factor. This contribution of order $(Z\alpha)^4$ can be parameterized as being proportional to the second moment of the charge distribution $\langle r_\alpha^2\rangle$.

The coefficient of the leading order finite size effect (*#r1*) is provided by Borie [3] and Karshenboim [5], and their results agree. Martynenko however only gives absolute energy values for the finite size effect and its higher order corrections in the Lamb shift: $-295.85 \pm 2.83\,\mathrm{meV}$. We have to divide by the square of the rms charge radius used in his calculations (1.676(8) fm) [4] to get the resulting coefficient given in Tab. II. All authors follow the previous calculations of Friar [35] in their summaries. Our value of the $\langle r^2\rangle$ parameter is given by the average of the three authors:

$$\Delta E_{(\mathrm{fin.size})} = -105.3210 \pm 0.0020\,\mathrm{meV/fm^2} \cdot \langle r_\alpha^2\rangle\,. \quad (6)$$

The $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$ and $(Z\alpha)^6$ corrections to this term have been calculated by Borie and Martynenko. Their results agree well for the $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$ radiative corrections (*#r2*).

For the finite size term of the order $(Z\alpha)^6$ (*#r3*) and the same-order correction (*#r3'*), Borie and Martynenko use different methods of calculation, see Ref. [8]. A term corresponding to the $\langle \ln r\rangle$ coefficient is part of term (*#r3*) for Martynenko and part of (*#r3'*) for Borie, leading to a correlation between both. In order to stay consistent with the summary in μD [8] we decided to average both terms providing $r3 = -0.1340 \pm 0.0030\,\mathrm{meV/fm^2}$ and $r3' = 0.067 \pm 0.012\,\mathrm{meV}$ until further studies can clarify the situation.

The influence of eVP insertions in the finite size effect has been studied by Borie, Martynenko and Karshenboim. The one- and two-loop contribution in the one-photon interaction are given by the term (*#r4*) in Tab. II. Agreement between the different calculations is a factor of two worse compared to the previous finite size contributions. Our value of $-0.3356 \pm 0.0059\,\mathrm{meV/fm^2}$ has been compiled by averaging (see Tab. II). This term has the largest uncertainty of all $\langle r^2\rangle$ coefficients.

Agreement for the one-loop eVP contribution in two Coulomb lines (*#r5*) is similar to the main finite size term, and our value was obtained by averaging. The two-loop eVP correction of the order $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$ (*#r6*), as well as the effect of two-loop eVP in two lines (*#r7*) has only been accounted for by Martynenko [4]. We use his value in our summary. The nuclear structure influence on the $2p_{1/2}$ state was only determined by Borie (*#r8*) [3]. We directly adopt her value, but change the sign of *#r8*



FIG. 2. Two-photon exchange in the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ Lamb shift. The two diagrams #r9 are contributing to the Friar-moment contribution $\Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{Friar}}$ while the similar diagrams #p0 show the nuclear polarizability of the helium nucleus $\Delta E^{LS}_{\mathrm{inelastic}}$. Thick dots indicate form factor insertions while the blob represents all possible excitation of the nucleus.

from the original publication to be consistent with our nomenclature of tabulating $\Delta E(2P-2S)$.

The total $\langle r^2\rangle$ coefficient of the Lamb shift is given by:

$$\Delta E_{\langle r^2\rangle} = 106.3582 \pm 0.0071\,\mathrm{meV/fm^2} \cdot \langle r_\alpha^2\rangle\,. \qquad (7)$$

This term is independent of higher moments of the nuclear charge distribution.

IV. TWO-PHOTON EXCHANGE

Important parts of the nuclear structure dependent Lamb shift contributions are created by the two-photon exchange (TPE) between muon and nucleus. It is usually separated into:

$$\Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{TPE}} = \Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{Friar}} + \Delta E^{LS}_{\mathrm{inelastic}}, \qquad (8)$$

$\Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{Friar}}$ is the elastic Friar-moment contribution [b], that is proportional to the third Zemach moment, and $\Delta E^{LS}_{\mathrm{inelastic}}$ is the inelastic part of the TPE, also called the nuclear polarizability.

A. The Friar-moment contribution in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$

The first part of the two-photon exchange ΔE^{LS}_{Friar} is given by the elastic Friar-moment contribution to the LS. It is the analog to the finite size effect in the two-photon interaction (see Fig. 2, *#r9*). It can be parameterized either directly proportional to the $\langle r^3_{(2)}\rangle$ moment of the nucleus' electric charge distribution or with the third power of the rms charge radius $\langle r^2\rangle^3$. The conversion factor between both parameterizations depends on the shape of the electric form factor [35].

Martynenko's calculation method of the Friar-term energy uses the electric FF in momentum space as parameterization. Therefore, the results depend rather strongly on the shape of the charge distribution of the nucleus [4]. The latter is also true for Borie's method [3, 36]. Martynenko used Gaussian and Dipole charge FF parameterizations for which Friar has given analytical solutions [26]. Using the ^{4}He charge radius of 1.676(8) fm [4] Martynenko determined an energy contribution of 6.61 meV for a Gaussian charge distribution and a value of 7.20 meV for a dipole distribution. This difference is bigger than all other uncertainties of the Lamb shift from QED and nuclear structure combined.

In an effort to reduce this uncertainty, we repeated Martynenkos calculation for experimental charge distributions measured in electron scattering experiments [37]. Sick provided us with an additional improved parameterization of current world data on elastic electron scattering on ^{4}He, by means of a sum of Gaussians charge distribution [38]. By numerical Fourier transformation we obtained the electric FF that reproduced the moments of the charge distribution reported in [39].

The shape of both experimental parameterizations of the FF can be seen in Fig. 3, together with the parameterizations used by Martynenko [4]. Excluding the dipole parameterization we obtain the energy the Friar-moment contribution *#r9*:

$$\Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{Friar}}(\mathrm{exp}) = 6.65 \pm 0.09\,\mathrm{meV} \qquad (9)$$

This value was obtained by considering the results of the two experimental datasets and is in agreement with the value reported by Martynenko for a Gaussian parameterization [4]. Borie also reports a similar energy for the Friar-term: $\Delta E_{Friar} = 1.4040\,\mathrm{meV/fm^3} \cdot \langle r^2\rangle^{3/2} = 6.67\,\mathrm{meV}$.

The uncertainty of the Friar-moment contribution extracted in Eq. (9) is larger than the uncertainty that can be obtained directly using the Friar-moment ($\langle r^3_{(2)}\rangle$) reported in [39] (16.73(10) fm^{-3}). From this we obtain:

$$\Delta E^{\mathrm{LS}}_{\mathrm{Friar}}(\mathrm{Sick}) = \frac{(Z\alpha)^5 m_r^4}{24}\,\langle r^3_{(2)}\rangle = 6.695 \pm 0.040\,\mathrm{meV}. \qquad (10)$$

This value is in good agreement with the value of Eq. (9), yet more precise.

Another independent value for the Friar-term was provided by Ji et al. [25], using two different models of the ^{4}He nucleus (see below). Their results assume that the terms δ_{Z1} and δ_{Z3} of the inelastic nuclear polarizability cancel *exactly* the elastic Friar-moment contribution, as

[b] To avoid confusion with the "Zemach radius" that occurs in the hyperfine splittings of muonic S-states for nuclei with nonzero spin, we adopt Karshenboim's suggestion and use the term "Friar-moment" for the item that Friar names "3rd Zemach moment" a long timae ago



FIG. 3. Parameterizations of the alpha particle electric form factor (FF) used in our calculations of the Friar-moment contribution. Shown are Gaussian (red, solid) and dipole functions (green, dash-dotted) together with two experimentally deduced FF parameterizations (purple and blue, dashed) [37, 38] on a linear (Top) and logarithmic scale (Bottom). The Gaussian and dipole FF reproduce $r_\alpha = 1.681\,\text{fm}$. The experimental fitting results agree with the Gaussian shape, and significantly diverge from the dipole parameterization at momentum transfers $\geq 0.2\,\text{GeV}$. We thus use a Gaussian-like FF and discard the dipole model.

has been shown to be true in electronic and muonic deuterium [27, 44]. The results of Ji et al. depend weakly on the *proton* rms charge radius, yielding 6.32(21) meV for the CODATA proton radius and 6.14(28) meV for the muonic hydrogen value of $r_p = 0.84087(39)\,\text{fm}$ [10]. Both values compare moderately well with the value in Eq. (10).

We choose Sick's value in our summary considering it is obtained by first principles directly from experimental data and has the smallest uncertainty.

The next order correction to the radius-dependent terms is provided by Martynenko (*#r10*). It includes terms of the order $(Z\alpha)^6$. Since the $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$ polarizability is currently only calculated up to the order of $(Z\alpha)^5$, there might be yet unknown partial cancellations between the two terms. We therefore adopt half of Martynenko's value with 100% uncertainty.

B. $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$ Polarizability

The second component of the two-photon exchange in Eq. (8) is given by the so-called nuclear polarizability contribution, $\Delta E^{LS}_{\textbf{inelastic}}$, that stems from the virtual excitation of the nucleus in the two-photon interaction (*#p0*). It is the least known part in the muonic Lamb shift theory, and limits the accuracy of the charge radius extraction from measured Lamb shift transitions in $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$.

The initial calculation of the polarizability was done by Friar stating a value of 3.1(6) meV [26]. Martynenko used this value in his summary [4], as did Borie in previous versions of hers [3]. Very recently, a more accurate calculation of the $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$ nuclear polarizability was done by Ji et al. using two parameterizations of the nuclear potential [25]. Their calculation uses the AV18 nucleon-nucleon force plus the UIX three-nucleon force, as well nucleon-nucleon forces plus three-nucleon forces from chiral effective field theory (χEFT) to calculate the terms up to the order $(Z\alpha)^5$. It provides an energy contribution of 2.47(15) meV that is in agreement with Friars value but four time more precise. Borie adopted the new value of Ji et al. [25] in the newest version of her summary. Ji et al. also updated their previous value of the nuclear polarizability to $\Delta E^{LS}_{\text{inelastic}} = 2.362(150)\,\text{meV}$ in recent proceedings [41].

In Ji et al. [25], the sum of their terms $\delta^1_{Z1} + \delta^1_{Z3}$ is believed to cancel exactly the elastic Friar-moment contributionΔE^{LS}_{Friar}, see above. This cancellation has shown to exist for muonic deuterium [27, 44]. In contrast, we do not use this cancellation and treat both parts of the TPE separately. Tab. IV gives an overview over all terms contributing to the inelastic TPE in μD, μ^3H, $\mu^3\text{He}^+$ and $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$, taken from the works of the TRIUMF/Hebrew group [25, 42, 43]. For the nuclear polarizability contribution in our summary we adopt the most recent value of Ji et al. [41]

$$\Delta E^{\text{LS}}_{\text{inelastic}} = 2.362 \pm 0.150\,\text{meV}. \tag{11}$$

In addition to the nuclear polarizability, also the contribution of the individual nucleons has to be considered. The first term is the Friar-moment contribution of the proton (*#p13*). We follow [43–45] and obtain its value in $(\mu^4\text{He})^+$ by using the proton's Friar-moment contribution in muonic hydrogen $\Delta E^p_{\text{Friar}}(\mu\text{H}) = 0.0247(13)\,\text{meV}$ provided in [46]. We scale it with the wavefunction overlap, that depends on the reduced mass (m_r) and proton number (Z) scaling to the third power. We account for the different number of protons in both systems with an additional Z ratio. Another reduced mass scaling factor enters from the third term in Eq. 11 of [44] according to [47]. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E^p_{\text{Friar}} &= \left(\frac{m_r(\mu^4\text{He})}{m_r(\mu\text{H})}\frac{Z(\mu^4\text{He})}{Z(\mu\text{H})}\right)^4 \Delta E^p_{\text{Friar}}(\mu\text{H}) \\ &= 0.541 \pm 0.028\,\text{meV}.\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where m_r denotes the reduced mass, see footnote [c].

Our value of the proton elastic Friar-moment contibution agrees with the result reported in [41].

Polarizability contributions of the individual nucleons have to be accounted for in the determination of the Lamb shift (*#p14+15*). The nucleon polarizability contribution for a proton-neutron pair in muonic deuterium was determined by Carlson et al. to be $\Delta E^{\rm hadr}_{\mu\rm D} = 0.028(2)\,\rm meV$ [48]. Since there are no corresponding values available for $(\mu^4\rm He)^+$ we obtain an approximate value by scaling the deuteron result with the nucleon number N, and the wavefunction overlap with the nucleus:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{\rm nucl.} =& \frac{N(\mu^4\rm He)}{N(\mu\rm D)}\left(\frac{m_r(\mu^4\rm He)}{m_r(\mu\rm D)}\frac{Z(\mu^4\rm He)}{Z(\mu\rm D)}\right)^3\Delta E^{\rm hadr}_{\mu\rm D}\\ =& \,0.486 \pm 0.069\,\rm meV.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The uncertainty of this value was chosen a factor of two larger than the one that would be obtained by scaling the μD value. This accounts for possible shadow effects that could exist in the ^{4}He nucleus.

The last term contributing to the elastic TPE in muonic atoms and ions is the subtraction term for protons and neutrons. The proton value was calculated for muonic hydrogen in chiral perturbation theory $\Delta E_{\rm sub}(p) = -0.0042(10)\,\rm meV$ [50]. For neutrons this term is still uncalculated. We therefore assume the same size with 100% uncertainty $\Delta E_{\rm sub}(n) = -0.0042(42)\,\rm meV$. According to [50], the subtraction term scales with the lepton wavefunction at the origin squared. We therefore multiply the doubled sum of proton and neutron subtraction term again with the wavefunction overlap:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{\rm sub} =& 2\left(\frac{m_r(\mu^4\rm He)}{m_r(\mu\rm H)}\frac{Z(\mu^4\rm He)}{Z(\mu\rm H)}\right)^3\\ &\cdot\left(\Delta E_{\rm sub}(p) + \Delta E_{\rm sub}(n)\right)\\ =& \,-0.170 \pm 0.087\,\rm meV.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The sum $\Delta E^p_{\rm Friar} + \Delta E_{\rm nucl.} + \Delta E_{\rm sub} = 0.857(112)\,\rm meV$ agrees with the sum of $\delta^{\rm hadr}_{\rm TPE} = 0.89(12)\,\rm meV$ reported by Ji et al. (see [41], Tab. 1). Our value is slightly larger since we calculated the nucleon polarizability term using Carlson's value for muonic deuterium [48] as basis, while Ji et al. extrapolate directly from muonic hydrogen.

[c] $m_r(\mu\rm H) = 185.84\,m_e$, $m_r(\mu\rm D) = 195.74\,m_e$, $m_r(\mu^4\rm He) = 201.07\,m_e$ $Z(\mu\rm H) = 1$, $Z(\mu\rm D) = 1$, $Z(\mu^4\rm He) = 2$, $N(\mu\rm D) = 2$, $N(\mu^4\rm He) = 4$

V. $(\mu^4\rm He)^+$ FINE STRUCTURE

The 2P fine structure splitting (FS) has been calculated by Borie [3] and Martynenko [28] (see Tab. III). Both determinations agree within 0.020 meV.

The leading order contribution to Borie's fine structure is given by the Dirac term of the order $(Z\alpha)^4$ (*#f1*). Borie provides additional recoil corrections (*#f2*) to her Dirac value not covered by her relativistic Dirac wavefunction approach. These corrections are already included in Martynenko's term (*#f3*). Martynenko separately calculates corrections to his term like the $(Z\alpha)^6$ contribution that provides 0.01994 meV to the FS value (*#f4a*), as well as additional corrections of the order $(Z\alpha)^6 m_1/m_2$ (*#f4b*) and $\alpha(Z\alpha)^6$ (*#f11*). The latter term is new in our FS summary and was not accounted for in μD [8] due to its negligible size. We sum the Dirac contributions of both authors, including all given corrections and take the average for our summary. Doing this, we find an unexpected 10 ppm difference in the Dirac-term calculation between both authors, as opposed to the much better agreement in the leading order Uehling term of the LS. This might be an indication for inconsistencies between the two methods.

Further corrections to the FS are given by eVP insertions in the FS interaction. Borie, Martynenko and Karshenboim have calculated the 1-loop eVP in both, one- (*#f5a*) and two Coulomb lines (*#f5b*) and get matching results for the sum of both terms. Martynenko and Borie additionally calculated the two-loop Källén-Sabry-type diagrams (*#f6a*) (corresponding to Fig. 1, *#4* in the LS). Both calculations of this term differ by a factor of two. The consecutive two-loop correction in one and two lines (*#f6b*) has been only calculated by Martynenko. The calculation of Karshenboim provides a sum of both terms that is significantly smaller than Martynenko's. We only average Martynenko's and Karshenboim's values for our determination since Borie's calculation is missing term *#f6a*.

The corrections of the order $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4 m$ (*#f7*) are only calculated by Karshenboim and are included in our summary.

Contributions of the muon anomalous magnetic moment to the fine structure were provided by Borie and Martynenko and agree perfectly (*#f8,#f9*).

The first order finite size contribution has a minor influence on the 2P FS interval because the $2P_{1/2}$ level has a small, yet non-zero wavefunction at the origin. Calculations of the first order term (*#f10a*) by Borie and Martynenko agree very well and we use the average. The term also appears as nuclear structure dependent part of the Lamb shift (*#r8*) and has to be accounted for in both the LS and the FS. The radius dependence is neglected in the FS since it only provides a minor influence to the total energy difference. For the second order contribution (*#f10b*) we adopt the only available calculation by Martynenko.

Martynenko also calculates the value of the one loop

μVP contribution to the FS that we adopt for our summary (*#f12*).

The total 2P fine structure in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ is given by:

$$\Delta E_{2P_{3/2}-2P_{1/2}} = 146.1972 \pm 0.0125\,\mathrm{meV}. \quad (15)$$

This is in reasonable agreement with the independently published values of Borie [3] and Martynenko et al. [28]. The uncertainty is given by the difference of the leading order Dirac term between Borie and Martynenko.

VI. CONCLUSION

We provided a summary of the Lamb shift and 2P-fine structure in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ that will be used for the extraction of the alpha particle charge radius from the measurements performed recently [1, 2]. We compared the calculations of Borie [3], Martynenko et al. [4, 28], Karshenboim [5, 23], Jentschura [6], Ji et al. [25, 40] and their colleagues. After sorting and comparing all individual terms we found some discrepancies between the different sources (see Tabs I-III): Two-loop eVP (*#4,#5*), $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4 m$ contribution (*#29*) and higher orders (*#12-#21*) in the QED LS, different finite size contributions (*#r1,#r3,#r3',#r4,#r5*), the elastic Friar-moment contribution (*#r9,#r10*), the proton-neutron subtraction term (*#p16*), as well as the sum of the Dirac contributions in the FS (*#f1-f11*).

Additionally, we reevaluated the elastic Friar-moment contribution of the two-photon exchange between muon and alpha particle. Using realistic FF parameterizations we arrive at an uncertainty which is sufficiently accurate for a r_α determination. Note that Martynenko's conservative uncertainty estimate is ten times larger.

In summary, we obtain the total energy differences of both 2S-2P transitions in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ as a function of the alpha particle mean square charge radius $\langle r_\alpha^2 \rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta E_{(2P-2S)} =& \Delta E_{(\mathrm{QED+Recoil})} + \Delta E_{(\mathrm{Finite\ Size})} + \Delta E_{(\mathrm{Friar}(\alpha))} + \Delta E_{(\mathrm{Pol.}(\alpha+\mathrm{n})+\mathrm{Friar(p)+Subt.})} \,[+\Delta E_{(\mathrm{Fine\ Structure})}] \\ =& 1668.487(14)\ \mathrm{meV} \\ & - 106.358(7)\ \mathrm{meV/fm^2} \cdot \langle r_\alpha^2 \rangle \\ & + 6.761(77)\ \mathrm{meV} \\ & + 3.296(189)\ \mathrm{meV} \\ & [+ 146.197(12)\ \mathrm{meV}] \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Of course, the $\Delta E_{(\mathrm{Fine\ Structure})}$ contributes only to the $2S_{1/2}-2P_{3/2}$ transition. For reference the finite size term amounts to 300.99 meV for $\langle r_\alpha^2 \rangle \approx 2.83\,\mathrm{fm}^2$.

The $\Delta E_{(2P_{1/2}-2S_{1/2})}$ energy difference corresponds to the sum of "our choice" from Tab. I and Tab. II. The $\Delta E_{(2P_{3/2}-2S_{1/2})}$ energy also includes the fine structure taken from Tab. III. The currently limiting factors in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ theory are the Friar-moment contribution (*#r9*), the inelastic nuclear polarizability contribution of the ^{4}He nucleus (*#p0*), as well as the corresponding contributions created by the two-photon exchange with the individual nucleons (*#p14+#p15*). Improvement on these terms will lead to a better alpha particle charge radius determination.

The terms labeled with an **[!]** in Tab. I, Tab. II and Tab. III have not been calculated for muonic ^{3}He, or are limiting the accuracy of a future helion rms charge radius extraction. Their timely calculation is very important, since we have already measured three transitions in $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$, and are currently analyzing the data. Important contributions are the nuclear- and nucleon polarizability. The former is currently under investigation by the TRIUMF/Hebrew group and results have been recently published [43]. The latter is still not directly calculated for $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$. Also the proton's Friar-moment contribution (*#p13*) and the proton and neutron subtraction terms (*#p16*) have to be calculated for the muonic system to improve the theory uncertainty. Furthermore, the influence of the Friar-moment has to be studied in $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$, similarly to the effort undertaken in this work. Dipole contributions to the FF shape are more likely in $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$, and could lead to energy shifts as already mentioned by Martynenko [4].

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank E. Borie, A. P. Martynenko, S. Karshenboim, S. Bacca and N. Nevo Dinur for fruitful discussions and corrections during the creation of this summary. We specially thank A. P. Martynenko for providing the tools to repeat their calculation of the Friar-moment, as well as I. Sick for providing electron scattering data on the alpha particle electric FF. M. D. J. J. K., B. F. and R. P. acknowledge support from the European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant StG, 279765. A. A. acknowledges support from the SNF, Project 200021_165854.

[1] T. Nebel et al. "The Lamb-shift experiment in muonic helium". *Hyp. Interact.* **212**, p. 195 (2012).

[2] A. Antognini et al. "Illuminating the proton radius conundrum: the μHe$^+$ Lamb shift". *Can. J. Phys.* **89**, p. 47 (2011).

[3] E. Borie. "Lamb shift in light muonic atoms - revisited". *arXiv* 1103.1772v7.

[4] A. A. Krutov et al. "Theory of the Lamb shift in muonic helium ions". *JETP Lett.* **120**, p. 73 (2015).

[5] S. G. Karshenboim et al. "Relativistic recoil corrections to the electron-vacuum-polarization contribution in light muonic atoms". *Phys. Rev. A* **85**. 032509 (2013).

[6] U. D. Jentschura et al. "Semi-analytic approach to higher-order corrections in simple muonic bound systems: Vacuum polarization, self-energy and radiative-recoil". *Eur. Phys. J. D* **65**, p. 357 (2011).

[7] A. Antognini et al. "Theory of the 2S-2P Lamb shift and hyperfine splitting in muonic hydrogen". *Ann. Phys.* **331**, p. 127 (2013).

[8] J. J. Krauth et al. "Theory of the n=2 levels in muonic deuterium". *Ann. Phys.* **366**, p. 168 (2016).

[9] R. Pohl et al. "The size of the proton". *Nature* **466**, p. 213 (2010).

[10] A. Antognini et al. "Proton structure from the measurement of the 2S-2P transition frequencies of muonic hydrogen". *Science* **229**, p. 417 (2013).

[11] P. J. Mohr et al. "Codata recommended values of the fundamental physical constants: 2010". *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, p. 1527 (2012).

[12] R. Pohl et al. "Muonic hydrogen and the proton radius puzzle". *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **63**, p. 175 (2013).

[13] C. E. Carlson et al. "The proton radius puzzle". *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **82**, p. 59 (2015).

[14] S. G. Karshenboim et al. "Theory of lamb shift in muonic hydrogen". *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **44**. 032509 (2015).

[15] G. A. Miller. "Toward a resolution of the proton size puzzle". *Phys. Rev. A* **84**. 020101 (2011).

[16] U. D. Jentschura. "Light sea fermions in electron-proton and muon-proton interactions". *Phys. Rev. A* **88**. 06514 (2013).

[17] B. Batell et al. "New parity-violating muonic forces". *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**. 011803.

[18] D. Tucker-Smith and I. Yavin. "Muonic hydrogen and mev forces". *Phys. Rev. D* **83**. 101702.

[19] I. Sick. "Precise root-mean-square radius of 4He". *Phys. Rev. C* **77**. 041302 (2008).

[20] M. Herrmann et al. "Feasibility of coherent xuv spectroscopy on the 1S-2S transition in singly ionized helium". *Phys. Rev. A* **79**. 052505 (2009).

[21] D. Z. Kandula et al. "XUV frequency-comb metrology on the ground state of helium". *Phys. Rev. A* **84**. 062512 (2011).

[22] R. van Rooji et al. "Frequency metrology in quantum degenerate helium: Direct measurement of the $2^3S_1 \rightarrow 2^1S_0$ transition". *Science* **333**, p. 196 (2011).

[23] E. Y. Korzinin et al. "$\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$ contribution to the Lamb shift and the fine structure in light muonic atoms". *Phys. Rev. D* **88**. 125019 (2013).

[24] B. R. Holstein and A. M. Nathan. "Dispersion relations and the nucleon polarizability". *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, p. 6101 (1994).

[25] C. Ji et al. "Nuclear polarization corrections in the μ^4He$^+$ Lamb shift". *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**. 143402 (2013).

[26] J. L. Friar. "Nuclear polarization corrections in μ^4He atoms". *Phys. Rev. C* **16**, p. 1540 (1977).

[27] K. Pachucki. "Nuclear structure corrections in muonic deuterium". *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**. 193007 (2011).

[28] E. N. Elekina et al. "Fine structure of the muonic ^{4}He ion". *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **8**, p. 331 (2011).

[29] U. D. Jentschura. "Relativistic reduced-mass and recoil corrections to vacuum polarization in muonic hydrogen, muonic deuterium, and muonic helium ions, theory of the n=2 levels in muonic deuterium". *Phys. Rev. A* **84**. 012505 (2015).

[30] S. G. Karshenboim et al. "Nonrelativistic contributions of order $\alpha^5 m_\mu c^2$ to the Lamb shift in muonic hydrogen and deuterium, and in the muonic helium ion". *Phys. Rev. A* **81**. 060501 (2010).

[31] T. Kinoshita and M. Nio. "Sixth-order vacuum-polarization contribution to the Lamb shift of muonic hydrogen". *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**. 3240 (1999).

[32] A. P. Martynenko et al. "Theory of the Lamb shift in muonic deuterium". *Phys. Atom. Nucl.* **77**, p. 786 (2014).

[33] S. G. Karshenboim et al. "Contribution of light-by-light scattering to energy levels of light muonic atoms". *JETP Lett.* **92**, p. 8 (2010).

[34] E. Borie. "Virtual Delbrück contribution to the energy levels of muonic atoms". *Nucl. Phys. A* **267**, p. 485 (2013).

[35] J. L. Friar. "Nuclear finite size effect in light muonic atoms". *Ann. Phys.* **122**, p. 151 (1979).

[36] E. Borie and G. A. Rinker. "The energy levels of muonic atoms". *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **54**, p. 67 (1982).

[37] C. R. Ottermann et al. "Elastic electron scattering from ^{3}He and ^{4}He". *Nucl. Phys. A* **436**, p. 688 (1985).

[38] I. Sick. "Priv. comm." (2015).

[39] I. Sick. "Zemach moments of 3He and 4He". *Phys. Rev. C* **90**. 064002 (2014).

[40] C. Ji et al. "Nuclear polarization effects in muonic atoms". *Few–Body Systems* **55**, p. 917 (2014).

[41] C. Ji et al. "Understanding the proton radius puzzle: Nuclear structure effects in light muonic atoms". *EPJ Web of Conf.* **113**. 03006 (2016).

[42] O. J. Hernandez et al. "Improved estimates of the nuclear structure corrections in μd". *Phys. Lett. B* **736**, p. 344 (2014).

[43] N. Nevo Dinur et al. "Nuclear structure corrections to the Lamb shift in 3He+ and 3H". *Phys. Lett. B* **755**, p. 380 (2016).

[44] J. L. Friar. "Nuclear polarization corrections to $\mu - d$ atoms in zero-range approximation". *Phys. Rev. C* **88**. 034003.

[45] G. A. Miller. "Non-perturbative lepton sea fermions in the nucleon and the proton radius puzzle". *Phys. Rev. C* **91**. 055204 (2015).

[46] C. E. Carlson and M. Vanderheagen. "Higher-order proton structure corrections to the lamb shift in muonic hydrogen". *Phys. Rev. A* **84**. 020102 (2011).

[47] N. Nevo Dinur. "Priv. comm." (2016).

[48] C. E. Carlson et al. "Nuclear-structure contribution to the Lamb shift in muonic deuterium". *Phys. Rev. A*

89. 022504 (2014).
[49] M. Gorchteyn, C. E. Carlson, and S. Bacca. "Priv. comm." (2015).
[50] M. C. Birse and J. A. McGovern. "Proton polarisability contribution to the Lamb shift in muonic hydrogen at fourth order in chiral pertubation theory". *Eur. Phys. J. A* **48**, p. 120 (2012).

nuclear structure independent terms

#	Contribution	Martynenko [4]		Borie-v7 [3]		Karshenboim [5, 23, 33]		Jentschura [6, 29]		Our Choice			Ref.
1	Non-Rel. one-loop electron VP (eVP)	1665.7730	#1			1665.7729	[5] Tab. I	1665.772	[29] Sec. II				
2	Rel. corr. to one-loop (Breit-Pauli)	0.5210	#7, 10			0.52110	[5] Tab. IV; #4	0.521104	[6] Eq. 17d				
3	Rel. one-loop eVP			1666.305	Tab. 5; #1								
19	Rel. RC to eVP $\alpha(Z\alpha)^4$			−0.0090	Tab. 5; #11								
	Sum: One-loop eVP (total)[a]	1666.2940		1666.296		1666.2940	[23] Tab. I; #1	1666.293		1666.2945	±0.0015		AVG Eq.(2)
4	Two-loop eVP (Källen-Sabry)	11.5693	#2	11.573	Tab. 5; #2								
5	One-loop eVP in 2 C-lines $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^5$	1.7075	#9	1.709[b]	Tab. 5; #3			1.707588	[6] Eq. 13d				
	Sum: Two-loop eVP [c]	13.2768		13.282		13.2769	[23] Tab. I; #2			13.2769	±0.0026	[!]	AVG Eq.(3)
6+7	Third-order eVP	0.0703	#4, 11, 12	0.074(3)[b]	Tab. 5; #4	0.074(3)	[23] Tab. I; #3			0.0740	±0.0030	[!]	K Eq.(6)
29	Second-order eVP contrib. $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$m	0.0021	#8, 13			0.00572	[23] Tab. VIII eVP2			0.0039	±0.0018		AVG
9	1:3 LbL (Wichmann-Kroll)	(−0.0199)[d]	#5;	−0.01984		−0.01995(6)	[33] Tab. III; #1					[!]	
10	2:2 LbL (Virtual Delbrück)					0.0114(4)	[33] Tab. III; #2					[!]	
9a	3:1 LbL					−0.0050(2)	[33] Tab. III; #3					[!]	
	Sum: Light-by-light scattering[e]	−0.0135[f]		−0.0136[e]		−0.0136(6)				−0.0136	±0.0006		K
20	μSE and μVP	−11.1070	#24	−11.105708	Tab. 2					−11.1063	±0.0006		AVG
11	μSE corr to eVP $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$	−0.0646[b]	#28 Eq. 99	−0.1314[g]	App. C Tab. 16	−0.06462	[23] Tab. VIII; a	−0.06462	[6] Eq. 29d	−0.0646			K, J
12	eVP loop in SE $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$	−0.0307	#27			−0.03073	[23] Tab. VIII; d						
30	Hadr. loop in SE $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$m					−0.00041(4)	[23] Tab. VIII; e						
13	Mixed eVP + μVP	0.0023	#3	0.00208	Tab. 5	0.00395	[23] Tab. VIII; b						
31	Mixed eVP + had.VP					0.0025(2)	[23] Tab. VIII; c						
21	Higher ord. corr. to μSE/μVP			−0.034663	Tab. 2								
	Sum: Higher orders [h]	−0.0284		−0.032583		−0.02469(20)				−0.0286	±0.0039		AVG
14	Hadronic VP	0.2229	#29	0.228(12)	Tab. 5; #7					0.2280	±0.0120		B
17	Recoil corr. $(Z\alpha)^4m^3/M^2$ (Barker-Glover)	0.2952	#21	0.2952	Tab. 5; #12			0.29518	[6] Eq. A3	0.2952			B, M, J
22	Rel. RC $(Z\alpha)^5$	−0.4330	#22	−0.4330	Tab. 5; #8			−0.433032	[6] Eq. 32d	−0.4330			B, M, J
23	Rel. RC $(Z\alpha)^6$	0.0038	#23							0.0038			M
24	Higher ord. rad. recoil corr.	−0.0377[f]	#25	−0.04737	Tab. 5; #9; p.9					−0.0474			B
28	Rad. (only eVP) RC $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$							0.003867	[6] Eq. 46d	0.0039			J
	Recoil finite size[i]			0.2662(1)	Tab. 5; #10								
	Sum	1668.4809		1668.8641(50)[j]						1668.4867	±0.0135		Eq.(5)

[a] sum: 1+2 or 3+19 [b] taken from [30] [c] sum: 4+5 [d] not part of final sum [e] sum: 9+9a+10 [f] taken from [33] [g] incomplete [h] sum: 12-21 [i] included in elastic TPE [j] taken from text in [3] p. 14

TABLE I. Terms contributing to the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ Lamb shift that are independent of the alpha particle nuclear structure. All values are given in meV. The last column shows the values used for our Lamb shift determination. Uncertainties for the different terms are either given in the respective publication or represent the spread of the different calculations. All values are given in meV. Terms marked with **[!]** are currently not calculated for $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$.

nuclear structure dependent terms

#	Contribution	Martynenko [4]		Borie-v7 [3]		Karshenboim [5]	TRIUMF/Hebrew [25, 40]	Our Choice		Ref.
r1	Non-Rel. finite size $(Z\alpha)^4$	$-105.323\ \langle r^2\rangle$	#14	$-105.319\ \langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b$_a$	$-105.32\ \langle r^2\rangle$ Tab. III; #1		$-105.3210\pm0.0020\ \langle r^2\rangle$		AVG Eq.(6)
r2	Rad. corr. finite size $\alpha(Z\alpha)^5$	$-0.0250\,\langle r^2\rangle$ [a]	#26; Eq. 9 2	$-0.0250\,\langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b$_b$			$-0.0250\ \langle r^2\rangle$		B, M
r3	Finite size corr. $(Z\alpha)^6$	$-0.1370\,\langle r^2\rangle$	#26; Eq. 91(1)	$-0.1310\,\langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b$_c$			$-0.1340\pm0.0030\ \langle r^2\rangle$		AVG
r4	Fin. size one&two-loop eVP $\alpha(Z\alpha)^4$ [b]	$-0.3414\,\langle r^2\rangle$	#16	$-0.3297\,\langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b$_d$	$-0.333\,\langle r^2\rangle$ Tab. III; #3		$-0.3356\pm0.0059\ \langle r^2\rangle$		AVG
r5	Fin. size one-loop eVP in 2 C-lines $\alpha(Z\alpha)^4$	$-0.5362\,\langle r^2\rangle$	#17	$-0.5392\,\langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b$_e$	$-0.536\,\langle r^2\rangle$ Tab. III; #2		$-0.5376\pm0.0016\ \langle r^2\rangle$		AVG
r6	Two-loop eVP corr $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$	$-0.0027\,\langle r^2\rangle$	#18					$-0.0027\ \langle r^2\rangle$		M
r7	Two-loop eVP in SOPT $\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4$	$-0.0065\,\langle r^2\rangle$	#19;					$-0.0065\ \langle r^2\rangle$		M
r8	Corr. to $2P_{1/2}$ level			$-0.004206\,\langle r^2\rangle$	Tab. 14b(2p1/2)			0.0042[b] $\langle r^2\rangle$		B
r9	Elastic TPE (Friar moment)	(6.61(7))	#15	(6.65)	Tab. 5; #16		(6.14(28)/6.32(28))	$6.695\ \pm0.040$	[!]	Eq.(10)
r10	One-loop corr. to elastic TPE [d]	0.1270	#20					$0.066\ \pm0.066$[c]	[!]	
p0	Nuclear polarizability	(2.47(15))[d]		(3.1(6))[e]	Tab. 5; #23		2.362(150) [41] #2	$2.362\ \pm0.150$		T Eq.(11)
p13	Proton Friar moment							$0.541\ \pm0.028$[f]	[!]	Eq.(12)
p14+p15	Nucleon polarizability							$0.486\ \pm0.069$[f]	[!]	Eq.(13)
p16	Proton-Neutron subtraction term							$-0.170\ \pm0.087$[f]	[!]	Eq.(14)
r3'	Remaining $(Z\alpha)^6$ contrib.	0.07846	#26; Eq. 91(2)	0.056	Tab. 5; #17			$0.067\ \pm0.012$		AVG
	Sum	-106.372$\langle r^2\rangle$+6.61(7)+2.54(15)		-106.340$\langle r^2\rangle$+6.65+3.17(60)				-106.3582(71)$\langle r^2\rangle$+6.761(77)+3.296(189)		

[a] wrong sign in [4] [b] sign changed due to convention [c] cancellations with α^6 terms in #p0 [d] originates from [25] [e] originates from [26] [f] this work

TABLE II. Nuclear structure dependent terms to the $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ Lamb shift with their respective charge radius scaling. All values are given in meV or meV/fm^2. Further discussion of the elastic and inelastic TPE contribution is given in the text. Charge radius dependent terms of the different orders are summed to provide the given parameterization. Terms in parentheses are not included in our summary, see text. Terms marked with [!] are currently not calculated in $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$ or are limiting the accuracy of the helion charge radius extraction.

fine structure

#	Contribution	Martynenko [28]		Borie-v7 [3]		Karshenboim [5, 23]	Our Choice			Ref.
f1	Dirac			145.7183	Tab. 7; #1					
f2	Recoil corr.			−0.1107	Tab. 7; #6					
f3	$(Z\alpha)^4$ contrib.	145.56382	#1							
f4a	$(Z\alpha)^6$ contrib.	0.01994	#3							
f4b	$(Z\alpha)^6 m_1/m_2$ contrib.	−0.00045	#4							
f11*	$\alpha(Z\alpha)^6$ contrib.	−0.00056	#8							
	Sum: Dirac [a]	145.58273		145.6076			145.59522	±0.01244		AVG
f5a	One-loop eVP (Uehling), $\alpha(Z\alpha)^4$	0.13167	#5							
f5b	One-loop eVP in FS interaction	0.14396	#7							
	Sum: One-loop eVP [b]	0.27563		0.2753	Tab. 7; #2	0.27502 [5] Tab. IV	0.27533	±0.00031		AVG
f6a	Two-loop eVP (Källen-Sabry)	0.00097	#10,11	0.0021	Tab. 7; #3					
f6b	Two-loop eVP in 2 C-lines	0.00231	#9,12,13							
	Sum: 2-loop eVP [c]	0.00328				0.00247 [23] Tab. VII	0.00288	±0.00041		M, K
f7	$\alpha^2(Z\alpha)^4 m$ contrib.					0.00478 [23] Tab. IX	0.00478			K
f8	μ anom. mag. mom. (a_μ)			0.3290	Tab. 7; #4					
f9	μ anom. mag. mom. higher orders			0.0013	Tab. 7; #5					
	Sum: μ anom. mag. mom. [d]	0.33032	#2	0.3303			0.33032			B, M
f10a	Finite size (1st ord.)	−0.01176	#14	−0.0119	Tab. 7; #7		−0.01183	±0.00007	[!]	AVG
f10b	Finite size (2nd ord.)	0.00045	#15				0.00045		[!]	M
f12*	One-loop μVP	0.00001	#6				0.00001			M
	Sum	146.18068		146.2034			146.19716	±0.01245		Eq.(16)

[a] sum: f1+f2 / f3+f4a+f4b+f11 [b] sum: f5a+f5b [c] sum: f6a+f6b [d] sum: f8+f9 [*] new term

TABLE III. Terms contributing to the fine structure in $(\mu^4\mathrm{He})^+$ taken from different sources. Terms in parentheses are not included in our summary, see text. Terms marked with [!] are currently not calculated for $\mu^3\mathrm{He}^+$. All values are given in meV.

#	Contrib. to nuclear polarizability (p0)	μD [42]			μ^3H [43]			μ^3He [43]			μ^4He [25]			μ^4He (This work)
		AV18	N3LO		AV18+UIX	χEFT		AV18+UIX	χEFT		AV18+UIX	χEFT		
p1	El. dipole excitation	1.907	1.926	$\delta^{(0)}_{D1}$	0.7669	0.7848	$\delta^{(0)}_{D1}$	6.479	6.633	$\delta^{(0)}_{D1}$	4.418	4.701	$\delta^{(0)}_{D1}$	
p2	Rel. corr. to p1, long. part	-0.029	-0.030	$\delta^{(0)}_{L}$	-0.0285	-0.0296	$\delta^{(0)}_{L}$	-0.232	-0.240	$\delta^{(0)}_{L}$	-0.289	-0.308	$\delta^{(0)}_{L}$	
p3	Rel. corr. to p1, trans. part	0.012	0.013	$\delta^{(0)}_{T}$	0.0128	0.0132	$\delta^{(0)}_{T}$	0.103	0.107	$\delta^{(0)}_{T}$	0.126	0.134	$\delta^{(0)}_{T}$	
p4	Rel. corr. to p1, higher ord.													
p5	Coulomb distortion, lead.	-0.262	-0.264	$\delta^{(0)}_{C}$	-0.0718	-0.0732	$\delta^{(0)}_{C}$	-1.000	-1.020	$\delta^{(0)}_{C}$	-0.506	-0.539	$\delta^{(0)}_{C}$	
p6	Coul. distort. subleading										-0.006	-0.007		
p7	El. monopole excitation	-0.042	-0.041	$\delta^{(2)}_{R2}$	-0.0199	-0.0206	$\delta^{(2)}_{R2}$	-0.632	-0.654	$\delta^{(2)}_{R2}$	-0.259	-0.324	$\delta^{(2)}_{R2}$	
p8	El. dipole-like ex.	0.139	0.140	$\delta^{(2)}_{D1D3}$	0.0783	0.0811	$\delta^{(2)}_{D1D3}$	0.841	0.862	$\delta^{(2)}_{D1D3}$	0.666	0.784	$\delta^{(2)}_{D1D3}$	
p9	El. quadrupole ex.	-0.061	-0.061	$\delta^{(2)}_{Q}$	-0.0344	-0.0358	$\delta^{(2)}_{Q}$	-1.015	-1.038	$\delta^{(2)}_{Q}$	-0.484	-0.561	$\delta^{(2)}_{Q}$	
p10	Mag. dipole excitation.	-0.008	-0.007	$\delta^{(0)}_{M}$	-0.0101	-0.0058	$\delta^{(0)}_{M}$	-0.081	-0.047	$\delta^{(0)}_{M}$	zero			
r9b	Point-proton Friar mom.	-0.357	-0.363	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z3}$	-0.1778	-0.1844	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z3}$	-8.100	-8.327	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z3}$	-4.183	-4.526	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z3}$	-6.65(10)[a]
r9a	NS correction to Friar mom.	-0.064	-0.065	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z1}$	-0.0453	-0.0463	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z1}$	-2.256	-2.291	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z1}$	-1.753	-1.811	$\delta^{(1)}_{Z1}$	
p12*b	Point-proton p-p charge corr.	zero			zero			8.539	8.711	$\delta^{(1)}_{R3}$	3.442	3.717	$\delta^{(1)}_{R3pp}$	
p12*a	NS correction p-p charge corr.							1.294	1.314	$\delta^{(1)}_{R1}$	1.240 [b]	1.282 [b]	$\delta^{(1)}_{R1pp}$	
p12	NS correction n-p charge corr.	-0.017	-0.017	$\delta^{(2)}_{np}$	-0.0280	-0.0287	$\delta^{(1)}_{R1}$				-0.392 [b]	-0.408 [b]	$\delta^{(1)}_{R1np}$	
p11	Subleading NS corrections	0.020	0.021	$\delta^{(2)}_{NS}$	0.0239	0.0247	$\delta^{(2)}_{NS}$	0.192	0.199	$\delta^{(2)}_{NS}$	0.279 [b]	0.293 [b]	$\delta^{(2)}_{NS}$	
#	Additional contributions													
p13	Prot. elast. 3rd Zemach				0.0327(17) [c]		δ^{N}_{Zem}	0.522(27) [c]		δ^{N}_{Zem}				0.541(28)
p14	Prot. inelast. pol	0.027(2)		$\delta^{(N)}_{pol}$	0.034(16)		$\delta^{(N)}_{pol}$	0.275(123)		$\delta^{(N)}_{pol}$	0.89(12) [41]		$\delta^{(N)}_{pol}$	0.496(97)
p15	Neut. inelast. pol													
p16	Prot. + Neut. subtraction term													-0.170(86)

[a] Recalculation using different el. FF [b] Values changed [47] [c] Values with corrected reduced mass scaling [47]

TABLE IV. Terms contributing to the inelastic TPE in μD, μ^3H, μ^3He$^+$ and μ^4He$^+$ taken from publications of the TRIUMF/Hebrew group. All values are given in meV. The last row shows terms contributing to the μ^4He$^+$ LS calculated in this work. The sum of μ^4He$^+$ terms is already accounted for in Tab. II.